

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/519,470	12/29/2004	Jean-Christophe Jaillant	4590-367	2685	
33308 75	90 08/04/2006		EXAMINER		
	TMAN GILMAN & BE	TO, TUAN C			
1700 DIAGNO ALEXANDRIA	STIC ROAD, SUITE 300 A. VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
, ibbii ii ibidi	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		3663		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/519,470	JAILLANT, JEAN-CHRISTO		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Tuan C. To	3663		
The MAILING DATE of this Period for Reply	communication app	ears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence a	ddress	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY P WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FRO - Extensions of time may be available under to after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date If NO period for reply is specified above, the Failure to reply within the set or extended period and the property received by the Office later than the same patent term adjustment. See 37 CF	M THE MAILING DA the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 to of this communication. maximum statutory period we priod for reply will, by statute, three months after the mailing	ATE OF THIS COMMUNION (1966). In no event, however, may a right apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become AE	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•	
Status					
 1)⊠ Responsive to communica 2a) This action is FINAL. 3) Since this application is in 	2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.	ers, prosecution as to th	ne merits is	
closed in accordance with	the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pendir 4a) Of the above claim(s) _ 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allow 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 6-9</u> is/are 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>4, 5, and 10-13</u> is 8) □ Claim(s) are subject	is/are withdrav ved. rejected. /are objected to.	vn from consideration.			
Application Papers		•			
9) The specification is objecte 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 and Applicant may not request the Replacement drawing sheet(sheet) The oath or declaration is contacted.	<u>December 2004</u> is/and it any objection to the objection	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊑ drawing(s) be held in abeyar ion is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 (CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) 🗖 Intentions	Summary (PTO-413)		
 Notice of Neterlances Cited (F10-032) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawin Information Disclosure Statement(s) (P Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/29/04. 		Paper No(:	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (P	TO-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langner et al. (US 6696980B1) and in view of Rennie (US 3786505)

As to claims 1 and 6, Langner et al. directs to a navigation system/method comprising: a display (140) (Langner et al., column 4, lines 59) that displays the feeler line and ground path (Langner et al., figure 1). While patent drawings are not drawn to scale, relationships clearly shown in the drawings of a reference patent cannot be disregarded in determining the patentability of claims. See <u>In re Mraz</u>, 59 CCPA 866, 455 F.2d 1069, 173 USPQ 25 (1972).

The secondary reference to Rennie teaches another navigation/method of an aircraft including the act of computing a ground path that an aircraft would follow in a turn at the maximum rate applicable to the landing phase of the aircraft (Rennie, figure 3).

Application/Control Number: 10/519,470 Page 3

Art Unit: 3663

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system/method as taught by Langner et al. to include the teachings of Rennie so that the pilot crews are well prepared for a landing.

As to claims 2 and 3, Langner et al., does not describe "a turn command when the feeler line is tangible to the ground path to be captured", however, such the turn command acted by a pilot is inherently included in the action of a pilot during controlling of the aircraft. The pilot is provided the cockpit instrument panels system with the display to show whether the feeler line is tangential to the ground path (see figure 1).

As to claim 7, the reference to Rennie teaches a computer system in which the central computer (52) (see Rennie, figure 3) computes a feeler line.

As to claims 8 and 9, the reference to Langner et al. provides a cockpit instrument panels with buttons (Langner et al, figure 1) for controlling the display of feeler line (Langner et al, figure 1, the line located in the middle of the display (140)).

Allowable Subject Matter

During the prior search, the examiner has realized the prior art fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of claims 4, 5, and 10-13, thus they are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3663

Conclusions

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan C To whose telephone number is (571) 272-6985. The examiner can normally be reached on from 8:00AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner,

Tuan C To

August 02, 2006